my traveling companions, in the early 1980's, as I was chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and we went to many different meetings that related to the defense of our country and with the defense establishments of other nations.

I have to say, however, Senator EXON's fame in my State was overshadowed by his wife, Pat, who is a much better fisherman, I mean fisherwoman; in my State we say ''fisherperson'' now. When they came to Alaska we enjoyed having them with us. I note, now that he is leaving the Senate, he may be able to come up and meet the challenge and be able to leave a little bit better record and surpass the records established by his wife when she was fishing with us in Alaska.

In terms of a Senator whom I have known for many years, Senator ALAN SIMPSON—I actually met him before he came to the Senate, as the son of the late Senator Milward Simpson. He was very active in Wyoming affairs, and prior to being here in the Senate, I remember meeting him at a Republican event in Wyoming. I have gotten to know him very well since he has been in the Senate.

Senator ALAN SIMPSON has served the Senate as the Republican whip longer than any Senator in our history. He served 10 years. As a westerner with particular understanding of the problems that are experienced by those of us who come from the West, he represented us very well with his knowledge of small population, public land States. With his very quick wit and his pithy observations of the circumstances that we face, he has always been able to find a solution that was acceptable to the Senate on issues that affected our Western States. He has generated a bipartisan solution in many instances when many of us thought there was no way out. It has taken real courage on his part in many instances to find that bipartisan solution.

The Senate has witnessed that just recently in the immigration issue. Knowing his departure was coming upon us, many of us have worked with him long and hard to try to help him achieve his goal of the passage of sound legislation in the immigration field.

We wish him and Ann, his lovely wife, the very best as they now return to Wyoming and to other endeavors. ALAN SIMPSON is also a person we are going to hear more about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that the Senator's time has expired.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I continue until someone comes. There is another Senator here. I will continue my comments later. Thank you very much.

Mr. BRADLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

SENATOR BRADLEY'S SPEECHES

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, the Senate floor is a place where speeches are made, sometimes longer than they should be, sometimes shorter than they should be. I have made my share of speeches on the Senate floor in the last 18 years. But a Senator is also called upon to speak off the Senate floor in gatherings in his or her State and in sites across the country.

I have often thought of the Senate speech as a form of communication, as a way of educating, as a way of leading. I have tried to do that on the Senate floor. In the last 2 years, we have had a number of restrictions that have made this kind of speech that I would give, which would be a very lengthy speech, more difficult in morning business as we have 10-minute time limits. For that reason, in the last 2 years I have given a number of speeches that have not been reflected in the RECORD but have been given at other forums across the country.

I believe that these were speeches that I worked on as a Senator. These were speeches that I thought about as a Senator and delivered as a Senator. Therefore, I believe that it is important that I share them with the Senate and for the RECORD. I see the Chair twitching a little bit. He need not worry that I am going to deliver all these speeches at this moment.

I would like to submit for the RECORD a speech called ''America's Challenge: Revitalizing Our National Community,'' ''After the Revolution: Rethinking U.S.-Russia Relations,'' ''Race Relations in America: The Best and Worst of Times,'' ''Harry Truman: Public Power and the New Economy,'' and the speech to the National Association of Radio Talk Show Hosts on the occasion of the Freedom of Speech Awards Gala Dinner. I ask unanimous consent that all of these speeches be printed in the RECORD and that they be my last official act as a U.S. Senator on the floor of the Senate.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S CHALLENGE: REVITALIZING OUR NATIONAL COMMUNITY

(By Senator Bill Bradley)

Two nights ago I attended a dinner in St. Louis, Missouri to honor former U.S. Senator Jack Danforth. Fifteen Senators from both parties attended along with several thousand Missourians. Nearly a million dollars was raised for an organization called Interact, to which Jack Danforth will dedicate much of his post-Senate energies. The organization's charter is to coordinate efforts by the religious community in St. Louis to support programs which will improve the life chances of inner-city, predominately African children.

When I left Missouri for college back in 1961 the number of children in St. Louis born to a single parent was 13%; now it is 68%. Among black children it is 86%. Senator Pat Moynihan points out that this social crisis is taking place across the North Atlantic world (English out-of-wedlock births are 31%, and in France, 33%) and Jack Danforth has waded into this crisis in hope of developing a strategy that can turn these tragic numbers around.

I begin with this story because Jack has chosen to leave government to tackle one of the nation's most intractable problems and he has chosen to do it through institutions of religious faith. His efforts may offer us a fresh perspective on our commitment to address not only single parenthood in poor neighborhoods, but what is happening to our sense of family and community in suburbs, cities and small towns across America.

Never in American history has a new vision begun in Washington. Never has it been the sole property of either political party. In fact, to initiate a frank discussion of our current American condition requires us to throw off many of the barnacle-encrusted categories with which we are accustomed to talking about this nation's problems. This could seriously disrupt the respective moral allegiances and political turfs of both the Democrats and Republican parties. I would like to start making that disruption happen, for out of such ferment might emerge the fresh ideas of a better American future.

Our contemporary political debate has settled into two painfully familiar ruts. Republicans, as we know, are infatuated with the magic of the ''private sector'', and reflexively criticize government as the enemy of freedom. Human needs and the common good are best served through the marketplace, goes their mantra.

At the other extreme, Democrats tend to distrust the market, seeing it as synonymous with greed and exploitation, the domain of Jay Gould and Michael Milkens. Ever confident in the powers of government to solve problems, Democrats instinctively turn to the bureaucratic state to regulate the economy and to solve social problems. Democrats generally prefer the bureaucrat they know to the consumer they can't control. Of course, both parties are somewhat disingenuous. Neither is above making self-serving exceptions. For example, Republicans say they are for the market, but they support market-distorting tax loopholes and wasteful subsidies for special interests as diverse as water, wheat, and wine. Then there are the Democrats who say that they want an activist government but won't raise the taxes to fund it or describe clearly its limits or its necessity. Still, these twin poles of political debate—crudely put, government action versus the free market—utterly dominate our sense of the possible, our sense of what is relevant and meaningful in public affairs. Yet, the issues that most concern Americans today seem to have little direct connection with either the market or government. Consider the plague of violence, guns, and drugs; the racial tensions that afflict so many communities; the turmoil in public education; the deterioration of America's families.

Today I will suggest that any prescription for America must understand the advantages and limits of both the market and government, but more importantly, how neither is equipped to solve America's central problems; the deterioration of our civil society and the need to revitalize our democratic process.

Civil society is the place where Americans make their home, sustain their marriages, raise their families, hand out with their friends, meet their neighbors, educate their children, worship their god. It is the churches, schools, fraternities, community centers, labor unions, synagogues, sports leagues, PTAs, libraries and barber shops. It is where opinions are expressed and refined, where views are exchanged and agreements made, where a sense of common purpose and consensus are forged. It lies apart from the realms of the market and the government, and possesses a different ethic. The market is governed by the logic of economic self-interest, while government is the domain of laws with all their coercive authority. Civil

society, on the other hand, is the sphere of our most basic humanity—the personal, everyday realm that is governed by values such as responsibility, trust, fraternity, solidarity and love. In a democratic civil society such as ours we also put a special premium on social equality—the conviction that men and women should be measured by the quality of their character and not the color of their skin, the shape of their eyes, the size of their bank account, the religion of their family, or the happenstance of their gender.

What both Democrats and Republicans fail to see is that the government and the market are not enough to make a civilization. There must also be healthy, robust civic sector—a space in which the bonds of community can flourish. Government and the market are similar to two legs on a three-legged stool. Without the third leg of civil society, the stool is not stable and cannot provide support for a vital America.

Today the fragile ecology of our social environment is as threatened as that of our natural environment. Like fish floating on the surface of a polluted river, the network of voluntary associations in America seem to be dying. For example, PTA participation has fallen. So have Boy Scout and Red Cross volunteers. So have labor unions and civic clubs such as the Lions and Elks. In the recent ''Mood of America'' poll taken by the Gannett News Service, 76 percent of those surveyed agreed that ''there is less concern for others than there once was.'' All across America, people are choosing not to join with each other in communal activities. One recent college graduate even volunteered sadly that her suburban Philadelphia neighbors ''don't even wave.''

Every day the news brings another account of Americans being disconnected from each other. Sometimes the stories seem comical, such as that of the married couple in Rochester, New York who unexpectedly ran into one another on the same airplane as they departed for separate business trips and discovered that each had, unbeknownst to the other, hired a different babysitter to care for their young daughter. Often the stories are less amusing, such as that of the suburban Chicago couple who, unbeknownst to their indifferent neighbors, left their two little girls home alone while they vacationed in Mexico. Or the story in New York City of the murder of a young woman in a running suit whose body went unidentified, unclaimed, and apparently unwanted for a week before she was identified by her fingerprints as a New Jersey woman wholly estranged from her family.

It is tempting to dismiss these stories as isolated cases. But I think they have a grip on our imaginations precisely because they speak to our real fears. They are ugly reminders of the erosion of love, trust, and mutual obligation. They are testimony to a profound human disconnectedness that cuts across most conventional lines of class, race and geography.

That is one reason, perhaps, that we love the television show, ''Cheers.'' It is the bar ''where everyone knows your name.'' How many of us are blessed with such a place in our lives? How many of us know the names, much less the life stories of all the neighbors in our section of town or even on several floors of our apartment building?

To the sophisticates of national politics, it all sounds too painfully small-time, even corny to focus on these things. After all, voluntary local associations and community connection seem so peripheral to both the market and government; both the market and the government have far more raw power. Government and business are national and international in scope. They're on TV. They talk casually about billions of dollars. In many ways the worlds of politics and business have de-legitimized the local, the social, the cultural, the spiritual. Yet upon these things lie the whole edifice of our national well-being.

Alongside the decline of civil society, it is a sad truth that the exercise of democratic citizenship plays, at best, a very minor role in the lives of most American adults. Only 39% of the eligible voters actually voted in 1994. The role formerly played by party organizations with face to face associations has been yielded to the media, where local TV news follows the dual credos, ''If it bleeds, it leads, and if it thinks, it stinks,'' and paid media politics remains beyond the reach of most Americans. Whey only the rich, such as Ross Perot, can get their views across on TV, political equality suffers. The rich have a loudspeaker and everyone else gets a megaphone. Make no mistake about it, money talks in American politics today as never before, and no revival of our democratic culture can occur until citizens feel that their participation is more meaningful than the money lavished by PACs and big donors.

Then, there are the campaigns that we politicians run which short-circuit deliberative judgment. People sit at home as spectators, wait to be entertained by us in 30-second pre-polled, pre-tested emotional appeals and then render a thumbs up or a thumbs down almost on a whim. Outside the campaign season, we, the elected leaders, too often let focus groups do our thinking for us. Public opinion does not result from reasoned dialogue, but from polls that solicit knee-jerk responses from individuals who have seldom had the opportunity to reflect on Bosnia, GATT, property taxes or public education in the company of their fellow citizens.

From the Long House of the Iroquois to the general store of de Tocqueville's America to the Chautauquas of the late 19th Century, to the Jaycee's, Lions, PTA's and political clubs of the early '60s, Americans have always had places where they could come together and deliberate about their common future. Today there are fewer and fewer forums where people actually listen to each other. It's as if everyone wants to spout his opinion or her criticism and then move on.

So what does all this imply for public policy?

First, we need to strengthen the crucible of civil society, the American family. Given the startling increase in the number of children growing up with one parent and paltry resources, we need to recouple sex and parental responsibility. Rolling back irresponsible sexual behavior (sex without thought for its consequences), is best done by holding men equally accountable for such irresponsibility. Policy should send a very clear message—if you have sex with someone and she becomes pregnant, be prepared to have 15% of your wages for 18 years go to support the mother and child. Such a message might force young men to pause before they act and to recognize that fatherhood is a lifetime commitment that takes time and money.

And, given that 40% of American children now live in homes where both parents work, we have only four options if we believe our rhetoric about the importance of child-rearing: higher compensation for one spouse so that the other can stay home permanently; a loving relative in the neighborhood; more taxes or higher salaries to pay for more daycare programs; or, parental leave measured in years, not weeks, and available for a mother and a father at different times in a career. The only given is that someone has to care for the children.

Secondly, we need to create more quality civic space. The most underutilized resource in most of our communities is the public school, which too often closes at 4:00 pm only to see children in suburbs return to empty homes with television as their babysitter or, in cities, to the street corners where gangs make them an offer they can't refuse. Keeping the schools open on weekdays after hours, and on weekends, with supervision coming from the community, would give some kids a place to study until their parents picked them up or at least would provide a safe haven from the war zone outside.

Thirdly, we need a more civic-minded media. At a time when harassed parents spend less time with their children, they have ceded to television more and more of the all-important role of story-telling which is essential to the formation of moral education that sustains a civil society. But too often TV producers and music executives and video game manufacturers feed young people a menu of violence without context and sex without attachment, and both with no consequences or judgement. The market acts blindly to sell and to make money, never pausing to ask whether it furthers citizenship or decency. Too often those who trash government as the enemy of freedom and a destroyer of families are strangely silent about the market's corrosive effects on those very same values in civil society. The answer is not censorship, but more citizenship in the corporate boardroom and more active families who will turn off the trash, boycott the sponsors and tell the executive that you hold them personally responsible for making money from glorifying violence and human degradation.

Fourth, in an effort to revitalize the democratic process, we have to take financing of elections out of the hands of the special interests and turn it over to the people by taking two simple steps. Allow taxpayers to check off on their tax returns above their tax liability up to $200 for political campaigns for federal office in their state. Prior to the general election, divide the fund between Democrat, Republican or qualified independent candidates. No other money would be legal—no PACs, no bundles, no big contributions, no party conduits—even the bankroll of a millionaire candidate would be off-limits. If the people of a state choose to give little, then they will be less informed, but this would be the citizens' choice. If there was less money involved, the process would adjust. Who knows, maybe attack ads would go and public discourse would grow.

Public policy, as these suggestions illustrate, can help facilitate the revitalization of democracy and civil society, but it cannot create civil society. We can insist that fathers support their children financially, but fathers have to see the importance of spending time with their children. We can figure out ways, such as parental leave, to provide parents with more time with their children, but parents have to use that time to raise their children. We can create community schools, but communities have to use them. We can provide mothers and fathers with the tools they need to influence the storytelling of the mass media, but they ultimately must exercise that control. We can take special interests out of elections, but only people can vote. We can provide opportunities for a more deliberative citizenship at both the national and the local level, but citizens have to seize those opportunities and take individual responsibility.

We also have to give the distinctive moral language of civil society a more permanent place in our public conversation. The language of the marketplace says, ''get as much as you can for yourself.'' The language of government says, ''legislate for others what is good for them.'' But the language of community, family and citizenship at its core is

about receiving undeserved gifts. What this nation needs to promote is the spirit of giving something freely, without measuring it out precisely or demanding something in return.

At a minimum, the language of mutual obligation has to be given equal time with the language of rights that dominates our culture. Rights talk properly supports an individual's status and dignity within a community. It has done much to protect the less powerful in our society and should not be abandoned. The problem comes in the adversarial dynamic that rights talk sets up in which people assert themselves through confrontation, championing one right to the exclusion of another. Instead of working together to improve our collective situation, we fight with each other over who has superior rights. Americans are too often given to speaking of America as a country in which you have the right to do whatever you want. On reflection, most of us will admit that no country could long survive that lived by such a principle. And this talk is deeply at odds with the best interests of civil society.

Forrest Gump and Rush Limbaugh are the surprise stars of the first half of the '90s because they poke fun at hypocrisy and the inadequacy of what we have today. But they are not builders. The builders are those in localities across America who are constructing bridges of cooperation and dialogue in face to face meetings with their supporters and their adversaries. Alarmed at the decline of civil society, they know how to understand the legitimate point of view of those with whom they disagree. Here in Washington, action too often surrounds only competition for power. With the media's help, words are used to polarize and to destroy people. In cities across America where citizens are working together, words are tools to build bridges between people. For example, at New Communities Corporation in Newark, New Jersey, people are too busy doing things to spend energy figuring out how to tear down. In these places there are more barn-raisers than there are barn-burners. Connecting their idealism with national policy offers us our greatest hope and our biggest challenge.

Above all, we need to understand that a true civil society in which citizens interact on a regular basis to grapple with common problems will not occur because of the arrival of a hero. Rebuilding civil society requires people talking and listening to each other, not blindly following a hero.

I was reminded a few weeks ago of the temptation offered by the ''knight in shining armor'' when the cover of a national magazine had General Colin Powell's picture on it with a caption something like, ''Will he be the answer to our problems?'' If the problem is a deteriorating civic culture, then a charismatic leader, be he the President or a General, is not the answer. He or she might make us feel better momentarily but then if we are only spectators thrilled by the performance, how have we progressed collectively? A character in Bertolt Brecht's Galileo says, ''Pity the nation that has no heroes,'' to which Galileo responds, ''Pity the nation that needs them.'' All of us have to go out in the public square and all of us have to assume our citizenship responsibilities. For me that means trying to tell the truth as I see it to both parties and to the American people without regard for consequences. In a vibrant civil society, real leadership at the top is made possible by the understanding and evolution of leaders of awareness at the bottom and in the middle, that is, citizens engaged in a deliberative discussion about our common future. Jack Danforth knows that, and so do thousands of other Americans who have assumed their responsibility. That's a discussion that I want to be a part of. The more open our public dialogue, the larger the number of Americans who join our deliberation, the greater chance we have to build a better country and a better world.

RACE RELATIONS IN AMERICA: THE BEST AND WORST OF TIMES

(By Senator Bill Bradley)

Slavery was America's original sin, and race remains its unresolved dilemma. For the last year, three Black males have dominated the nation's focus on race. They are OJ Simpson, Louis Farrakhan and Colin Powell. Each in his own way fed America's appetite to live vicariously and to shrink from confronting our racial reality. Each said something different about the state of race relations in America. They allowed White Americans to either ridicule, demonize, or idealize Black Americans. The OJ case conveyed an almost irrevocable division between Blacks and Whites with the same disparate percentages of Blacks and Whites feeling he was guilty before and after the trial. Louis Farrakhan allowed Whites to attack the messenger rather than confront the part of his message about the desperate conditions in much of Black America. Colin Powell permitted White America to fantasize that an answer to our racial divisions amounted to no more than, ''We like you; you do it for us.''

Any person, Black or White, touched by the media becomes bigger than life so that, as with the latest athletic virtuoso, the rest of us become spectators. Little of the media attention on these men recognized the kind of work necessary for individual Americans, Black and White, to bridge the racial divide. In each of their stories, the media, with its need to oversimplify, was crucial in building them up or tearing them down or both in sequence. Each of them became more a symbol than a human being.

The real heroes, however, are not the ones that the media churns up and then discards. The real heroes are the parents who lead every day in their homes (as Barbara Bush said. ''What happens in your house is more important than what happens in the White House''), and the citizens and community leaders who are not courting fame, but producing results, who give of themselves because they hold certain values about people in America.

For example, there were other African Americans this year—Anna Deavere Smith, Mark Ridley-Thomas, Kimberle Crenshaw and Harlon Dalton—who hardly made a ripple in our mass culture. If you know their names, raise your hand. Yet, each in his or her own way through art, government, writing and the law was confronting the hard facts of our reality and raising the deeper questions of race related to identity and to our common humanity. Anna Deavere Smith, a professor and playwright, was writing and acting the voices of Jews and Blacks in Crown Heights, New York and, in the work called Twilight: Los Angeles, finding rich strains of diversity in Black America itself as well as the words of White Americans who are part of the racial dialogue. L.A. city councilman, Mark Ridley-Thomas was conceiving, organizing and carrying out racial dialogues during some of the tensest race moments in Los Angeles' history. Law professor, Kim Crenshaw, through an analysis of the legal history of civil rights, was brilliantly revealing the attitudinal antecedent to today's White backlash against affirmative action and in so doing, asking us all if we really want to head down that road again. Finally, Harlon Dalton, author, singer, and professor, was challenging people of good will in both races to risk candor and build a new political vision that could dry up the fear and heal the wounds of racial division.

What each of them was saying in different ways was that the issue of race can never be a Black issue alone—not only because America is blessed by an abundance of Asian Americans, Latino Americans, and Native Americans, but because a racial dialogue cannot take place without White Americans becoming full participants. White Americans have a race too. Black separatists flourish where Whites shut their doors to dialogue and assume no responsibility for their own stakes in racial healing.

As America heads into a presidential election year and California confronts affirmative action in one of its ballot initiatives, the racial landscape of America seems full of land mines. Yet it is precisely at such moments of heightened awareness that we can make the greatest progress because it is at those moments that the necessary pain of candor can be endured and then transcended. So let us ask people who run for president to give us their pedigrees on race, including the real life experiences that led them to their present understanding. Let us urge them to step up to the subject regularly, not just when there is a racial explosion somewhere in America. Let us urge Republicans not to play the race card and Democrats to do more than the minimum to ensure a strong Black voter turnout. Above all, let both parties stop demagoguing the tragic issue of welfare, and start digging deeper into themselves about America's racial future. To expect less is to admit that our politics has failed us on one of America's most important issues.

So what is the state of Black-White relations in America? Both Black and White America are caught in a traumatic economic transformation in which millions of Americans feel insecure about their future and for good reason. There are 130 million jobs in America and 90 million of them involve repetitive tasks, which means that a computer can displace any of those jobs. In a world where credit departments of 300 people are routinely displaced by 10 computer workstations, more and more Americans will lose good paying jobs along with their health insurance and often their pensions, so that corporate profits can rise and productivity increase.

During the first six months of 1993, the Clinton Administration announced that 1.3 million jobs had been created, to which a TWA machinist replied, ''Yeah, my wife and I have four of them.'' And indeed, over half of the newly created jobs were part-time.

If you're African American, you've seen it before. In the 1940s the cotton gin pushed Black field hands off the farms of the South and to the cities of the North. Labor-intensive manufacturing jobs seemed to be the Promised Land. Then automation arrived and the last hired were the first fired and millions of unskilled Black workers lost their jobs. Still, many hung on in the manufacturing sector. Then, with the advent of information technology and foreign competition, labor unions, such as the multiracial steelworkers saw their membership plummet from 750,000 in 1979 to 374,000 in 1990. Finally, in the 1960s and '70s, government began to employ African Americans in sizable numbers, but in the 1980s and 1990s, with the fiscal crunch in full progress, government employees were let go. In the midst of the information revolution, just as in the midst of any recession, tough economic winds become a hurricane for African Americans.

Many White Americans who have been caught in the cold winds for the first time feel disoriented. Many become easy prey for politicians who want to explain deteriorating standards of living by stigmatizing Black Americans. ''You have lost your job,'' these

mischief makers say, ''because of affirmative action or because of the money government spends to help the poor.'' Instead of seeing the demographic reality-that only as all Americans advance will White Americans advance—they often fall into the scapegoating trap. It's an old story.

In California, a white-collar worker named Ron Smith who lost his job at McDonnell-Douglas two years ago, told a journalist how his sense that he was ''starting to lose my grip'' feeds into the divisiveness that is tearing our country apart: ''I get angry, and a lot of anger is coming out,'' he said. ''I'm blaming everyone—minorities, aliens coming across the border. I don't know how much truth there is to it. I mean, I don't think there are any planners and engineers coming across the border. But it hurts when you go to an interview and you know damn well you can do the job, and you know they are looking at you and thinking, 'Forget it.'''

The fact is that, economically, Black America is in the best and worst of times. Roughly a third of Black America can now be called middle class. Black Americans distinguish themselves in virtually every field of endeavor. But more than 30% of Black Americans live in grinding poverty. Many can't find a job, can't get credit to buy a house or start a business, and increasingly can't make ends meet for necessities, much less save for the future. Indeed, the unemployment rate for Blacks is routinely twice that for Whites. Also, the earnings of Black college-educated men have only recently reached parity with those of White men with high school diplomas. Of greater significance is the fact that 46% of Black children live below the poverty line, compared with 17% of White youngsters.

Without question, disintegrating family structure contributes to Black poverty. The average income for a two-parent Black family is three times the income of a single-parent White family. But poverty is more than a Black problem. It is a broad national systemic issue flowing from inadequate economic growth unfairly shared. Indeed, there are 16 million more White Americans in poverty than there are Black Americans in poverty. But many Whites feel it is primarily a Black problem. Because of lingering racial attitudes and stereotypes, marshaling resources to cope with it becomes more difficult. In that sense, racism contributes to Black poverty and to White poverty, too.

The conflict between generations in the Black community is real and the primary responsibility for bridging it rests with the Black community. There is a breakdown in communication and a breakdown in values. When I left Missouri for college in 1961, the number of children in St. Louis born to a single parent was 13%; now it is 68%. Among Black children it is 86%. In some cities, such as Baltimore, 55% of the African American males between the ages of 18 and 34 are either in jail, on probation, or awaiting trial. The idealistic call of Martin Luther King, Jr. or the disciplined march of Muslims who have declared war on Black self-destruction, can't compete with the latest gangsta rapper who from the TV screen calls young people to a life of crime, violence, White hate, and female abuse. Increasingly, a generation with little to lose pulls the trigger without remorse, risks nothing for their neighbor and invests little in their own futures. They live for today, some because that's all they have ever done and others because they believe that their tomorrow will only be worse.

Is the plight of this element of young Black America an isolated cancer, or a harbinger of all our futures? Is the message of these young black Americans pathological or prophetic? Will the rest of America respond or turn its back?

White Americans seem to have ignored the devastation in many American cities. Both government and the private sector have proven inadequate to the task of urban rejuvenation. It's almost as if the kids with AIDS, the gang members with guns, the teenagers lost to crack cocaine, the young rape victim whose only self-respect comes from having another child, don't exist for most White Americans. That is why the Million Man March was so important. Although it was based on the premise that White Americans won't help, it was itself I think a remarkable moment in American history. First, in a country where murder is the number one cause of death among young African American males, and where single-parenthood continues to rise, and where drugs and dealing drugs are sometimes the profession of choice for the young as opposed to teaching or becoming a minister of any faith, it is enormously positive to have a million African American men come together and say, We're going to take individual responsibility to change these circumstances. But, similar to Promise Keeper, a group of the Christian community that gathers 50,000 predominantly White middle-class men in a stadium where they pledge to be good fathers and husbands, the hard part is living the pledge every day. The test will be whether the million men return to their communities, reduce the violence and drugs and become meaningful figures in the lives of fatherless children.

My Senate office legal counsel, who is African American, attended the Million Man March on the National Mall. He told me that the atmosphere was electric and that it reflected great diversity. For example, a Korean American woman was selling soda and ice-cream and at one point during the day, up came a Black man to purchase a drink. Another Black man was standing nearby with his arms folded, and he said, ''No, not today brother; today you buy from a brother, not from her.'' Another one came up and said, ''Not today brother; today you buy from a brother, not from her.'' A third guy came up and said the same thing, but the third guy replied, ''What do you mean, 'I buy from the brother'? Don't you realize you're doing the same thing to her that was done to us for 200 years. I'm buying from her!'' And he does. Another one came up, the same experience, an argument: ''I'm buying from her because why should we discriminate against her the way we've been discriminated against?'' The Million Man March was not of one mind; it was a million minds whose faces happened to be Black.

Minister Louis Farrakhan has said things that are on many levels despicable. But more importantly, in practical terms, his separatist message is a dead end. If he succeeds in countering self-destructive behavior while also separating the Black community from the White community, what he will have created is the equivalent of many a segregated neighborhood prior to the civil rights revolution. Ultimately, the question is not only how do we counter the poverty, violence and family disintegration, but how do we all live together?

Although some Black Americans resent it, White Americans also have a view on how we can resolve the problem of race. Although some White Americans resent it, Black Americans can challenge us to reflect on our own race. Among other things, that means that we have to recognize that the flip side of racial discrimination is racial privilege, which consists of all those things that come to White Americans in the normal course of living; all the things they take for granted that a Black person must never take for granted. Race privilege is a harder concept to grasp than racial discrimination, especially for Whites, because it is more subtle. It is rooted in assumptions about every day, yet there is no denying it. For example, if I'm looking to buy a house and I'm White, I never fear someone will say no to me because of my race, but if I'm Black, I constantly make assessments about what is possible, problematic or impossible. That freedom from fear is a White skin privilege. If I'm White, I know that if I meet the economic criteria I'll get the loan. If I'm Black, I know I might not. Skin privilege means that I don't have to worry that my behavior will reflect positively or negatively on my race; it will reflect only on me and on my family. Skin privilege means that I can relate to a stranger without first having to put them at ease about my race. I know Black males who walk the street whistling classical music to let Whites know they're not dangerous.

As long as White America remains blind to its own racial privilege, Black Americans will feel that the focus falls too heavily on them. I never thought much about my skin privilege until I became a professional basketball player. That was a time when pundits asserted that the reason some teams drew sparse crowds was because they had five Black starters. Suddenly, in my first year, I began to receive offers to do commercial endorsements. I felt that they were coming to me instead of my Black teammates not because I was the best player; I wasn't. No, they were coming because of skin privilege, because I was me and I was White and marketers still believed, like the teams that hesitated to start the five best players because they might be Black, that a White public would never buy from a Black salesman. Some companies still believe that. That's why Bill Cosby's Jell-O ads were so important and why Michael Jordan must never forget who paved the way.

As long as White America believes that the race problem is primarily a Black problem of meeting White standards to gain admittance to White society, things will never stabilize and endure. But the flip side of White skin privilege is negative Black attitudes—reflected in even small things, such as coldness in daily interactions at work, slowdowns in providing services to Whites, or gathering at separate tables in cafeterias—that cast any attempts by Whites at racial dialogue as disingenuous and illegitimate. African Americans have to open up their worlds to Whites just as Whites have to open up their worlds to Blacks. Without that kind of candor, the dialogue will be phoney. Without that kind of mutual interest, the ties will not bind. Without that kind of mutual commitment, racial hierarchy will persist.

I believe most White Americans are not racist. Mark Fuhrman is, thank God, the exception, not the rule. Most White Americans easily reject the crude stereotyping and violent race hate of a Fuhrman. We are no longer living in a time where a group of German prisoners of war could be served at a Kansas lunch counter, while the Black soldiers guarding them could not sit next to them. We are no longer living at a time when in Washington, D.C. a priest refused to continue his sermon until a Black worshiper moved to the back of the church. Today there is something much more subtle afoot in America. As Harlon Dalton writes of the African American experience:

Instead of having doors slammed in our faces, we are cordially invited to come on in. Instead of being denied an application, we are encouraged to fill one out. Instead of failing to make the first cut, we make it to the final round. And when the rejection letter finally arrives, it has a pretty bow tied around it, (Something like: ''We were not able to make you an offer at this time, but we really enjoyed having the chance to get

to know you.'') Similarly, we hardly ever run into Bull Connor or even David Duke anymore. Instead, we encounter people who are ostensibly on our side and who seek to protect us from the stigma of affirmative action and the dependency created by too much government support. Instead of confronting nasty people intent on using our color against us, we are surrounded by perfectly nice people who embrace the colorblind ideal with a vengeance.

All of this poses a question I raised in 1992 at the Democratic Convention. The silence of good people in the face of continuing racism is often as harmful as the actions of bad people. While most people aren't racist, there are some White and Black people in America who do remain racists, spewing hostility toward another person simply because of his or her race. There are White politicians who play the ''race card'' and there are Black politicians who play the ''racist card.'' But the word racist is over used. Most people aren't brimming over with race hatred. To say that someone who opposes affirmative action is racist denies the possibility that the person may just be ignorant or unknowledgeable. If one hurls the epithet, ''racist'' a meaningful dialogue is unlikely to follow and it is only out of candid conversations that Whites will discover skin privilege, Blacks will accept constructive criticism from Whites and progress will come steadily.

But let us not abandon the quest to end racism. Let us root out what Harlon Dalton calls those ''culturally accepted beliefs that defend social advantage based on race.'' To do that however, takes individual initiative and involvement. That begins with a President and doesn't end until all of us as individuals become engaged. Ronald Reagan denied that there was any discrimination in America, much less racism. George Bush was a little better, but then he appointed Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court who, in an odd twist, turned the clock back on the whole issue. And now Bill Clinton says, Yes, there is racism; yes we need affirmative action; and yes, I'll give my own pedigree in terms of my own experience. I believe he is strongest when he talks about conviction related to race because I do think he has that conviction. But the question we need to hear him answer is, What are we going to do about it? One would like to see him talk about it more, to remind people of our history, to educate Americans about why it's important that we get beyond these stupid divisions that diminish our possibilities as individuals and as a nation.

Affirmative action takes on such a disproportionate place in our national politics because many Whites cannot conceive of White skin privilege and because discrimination, when it occurs, remains largely unaddressed. Why not deal with the underlying issue which is discrimination and facilitate remedies for discrimination? Affirmative action is a response to a discriminatory pattern over many years in institutions run by individuals who are confident that they don't have to change. To the extent that you don't remedy individual discrimination early and forcefully, then you are going to have thousands of judges around this country making broad brush rulings that often seem unfair to Whites. And then you're going to have other self-interested groups in the name of affirmative action asking for things that are not affirmative action. It's beyond me for example, how giving a group of investors who have an African American participant a tax subsidy in the purchase of a radio or television station is affirmative action; it's not. But it's easier to say no if you can say yes to facilitating the battle against discrimination. You cant say no unless you realize that in some place affirmative action is the only way we can balance White skin privilege. For example, the US military, even after President Truman's desegregation order, remained a bastion of White, often Southern, officers. It took Jimmy Carter and his African American secretary of the Army, Clifford Alexander, to change the way promotions were granted so that Black officers had a chance to become generals. In other words, without Cliff Alexander, there would be no Colin Powell. If you don't believe me, ask Colin Powell. If you believe that that was then and this is now, and that there is no need to look at other institutions, I refer you to the report of the Glass Ceiling Commission. I ask you only to answer why there are no Black CEOs of major corporations and why major New York law firms still have only a minuscule number of Black partners.

To understand what needs to be done requires knowing a little history. The issue arose during the consideration of the 1964 Civil Rights Act: Do we put an administrative enforcement mechanism in the law to remedy discrimination in employment? The Republicans in the Senate said they would join the Southern Democrats and filibuster the bill if President Johnson gave the soon-to-be-created EEOC an administrative enforcement mechanism, so he dropped it out. Now, if there is an act of discrimination, what you do is file a petition with the EEOC. But there is no way to bring the issue to a conclusion. So, the case languishes indefinitely. There are now 97,000 cases backlogged at the EEOC. Imagine you're a competent mid-level clerk in a company that has promoted Whites, but rarely a Black, or you're the 25th African American who's applied for a job with a police department in a city that is overwhelmingly African American, and not one has ever been accepted and so you decide to bring a case at the EEOC. After five years you get no remedy. So then you go to court for another five years, at the end of which you may or may not get a remedy, which means for people of modest means, you don't have a remedy for discrimination because you can't afford a lawyer for ten years in order to get your promotion from a $30,000 to $40,000 a year job.

The EEOC should have the same power that the National Labor Relations Board has, which is cease and desist authority, the ability to bring a case to a conclusion and say, Yes, there was discrimination and this is a remedy, or say, no, there was no discrimination, this is frivolous. With a more streamlined procedure for resolving charges of discrimination, companies would pay less to lawyers defending them against frivolous cases and individuals who have a legitimate claim would get a more timely resolution to the problem of discrimination. But once given real power, the EEOC has to resist ridiculous interventions that allow Americans who don't want to fight discrimination an excuse to discredit the whole EEOC effort. Self-indulgence at the EEOC breeds disrespect for what should be a mechanism of our national self-respect.

Finally, when it comes to attacks on affirmative action, it is important to see how similar they are to the legal justification for segregation in the 19th Century. As Kimberle Crenshaw points out in a brilliant paper, treasured American values such as autonomy, freedom, individualism, and federalism were deployed in support of discrimination. For example, the Supreme Court ruled that a White person deciding to prohibit a Black person from riding in a certain train car was exercising his individual freedom of contract. Decades later, Thurgood Marshall and other freedom fighters argued before the court that even though the acts of individual discrimination might be protected as private rights of contract, the discriminatory practices were so widespread that they acted as an impediment to interstate commerce for Black people as a group. Individual freedom yielded to group remedy for group discrimination. Thus, the interests of the national community to prevent racial discrimination took precedence over the individual right to bar Black Americans from enjoying the benefits of full citizenship.

Today, many of the people who oppose affirmative action and state a preference for color blindness and justify their position by reference to the American tradition of considering individuals equal before the law are often the same people who seldom have Black friends and who will choose the White teacher for their children every time. when people shout reverse discrimination they ignore our history, the continuation of subtle White skin privilege, and the fact that more White people lost their jobs in the 1982 recession than blacks have gained jobs from court-ordered affirmative action since its inception. When people diminish real, not imagined, Black contributions to our society as if they were a threat to our historical canon, they diminish their own understanding of themselves and their country. What is at work here is the attempt to again distort traditional American values to slow down progress on race.

During the civil rights era, the message was that Black Americans wanted to make something of themselves through hard work, religious devotion, political activism and educational attainment. White America had only to do what was in its own long-term interests anyway and remove the architecture of racial oppression. The movement had the high moral ground. Today, with murder, AIDS and drugs running rampant through the black community, with many blacks unwilling to accept some of the responsibility for their predicament, White Americans seem more and more unwilling to make sacrifices to change the abysmal physical conditions. When black separatists come across more like Governor Wallace than Martin Luther King, they give those Whites who are only marginally interested in Black folks in the first place a reason to turn off.

To counter the human devastation in parts of urban America, chronicled so vividly by Jonathan Kozal in Amazing Grace and Savage Inequalities, will take an heroic effort by thousands in the Black and White communities working together. It will take police departments that do their jobs conscientiously and with adequate resources. It will take schools that are teaching institutions, not simply warehouses for storing our children. It will take surrogate families who will express some small love for a kid without parents. It might even take boarding schools for kids that can't make it in the neighborhood. Above all, it will take a new biracial political vision that acts, because to fail to act will stain our ideals, diminish our chances for long-term prosperity, and short-change our children—all our children.

In the 1960s the Civil Rights movement thrived on the assumption that an America without racism would be a spiritually transformed America. That, after all, is what affirmative action affirms—that America can get over its racial nightmare; that few in America should be poor or dumb, or violent because the rest of us have cared too little for them; that no one in America should have a racial limit set on where their talents can take them; and that the process of seeing beyond skin color and eye shape allows us not to ignore race but to elevate the individual. A new political vision requires people to engage each other, endure the pain of candor, learn from each other's history, absorb each other's humanity and move on to higher ground. Such is the task of those who care

about racial healing. It won't happen overnight nor will one person bring it, however illustrative his career, nor will one person destroy it, however heinous his crime or poisonous his rhetoric. It can never be just about numbers. It must ultimately always be about the human spirit. What will be built has its foundation in the individual interactions of individual Americans of different races who dialogue and then act together to do something so that like a team, a platoon, a group building a home or cleaning up a park, something is transformed because of the common effort. Slowly, with acts of brotherhood transforming physical circumstances even as they bind the ties among the participants, we can say that racial progress has ceased retreating and is once again on the advance. In other words, only together can we chart a brighter future.

HARRY TRUMAN: PUBLIC POWER AND THE NEW ECONOMY

(By Senator Bill Bradley)

I understand that I am getting this award because the Truman Award Commission felt that I exemplify at least some of the traits of President Harry S. Truman. I came up with three that I know both he and I share: We were both born in Missouri of Scotch Irish heritage; neither of us were considered natural public speakers; and, occasionally, we could be considered just a little bit stubborn. As Bess Truman would point out if she were here today, some of these traits are shared with old Missouri mules, except that a mule might have given a better keynote speech that I did at the 1992 Democratic National Convention.

That I should receive the Truman Award is a great honor because I have been long been an admirer and a student of his political career. Truman's come from behind Senate reelection campaign in 1940, which in many ways was a precursor to the 1948 presidential race, was the subject of my Princeton senior thesis, entitled ''On That Record I Stand.'' I had wanted to read my entire 140-page senior thesis today but fortunately for all of you, there isn't the time.

Some thirty years after I wrote my college thesis, I found myself again thinking about the 33rd president and remembering a conversation I had with a couple of ''good ole boys'' from North Carolina. They had told me how they didn't like Jesse Jackson, whom they considered a ''rabble-rouser,'' nor Jesse Helms, whom they considered ''a disgrace to the state.'' So, I asked them for their favorite president. ''Harry Truman,'' one shot back, ''because he was one of the people, and when he spoke we could understand him. Just because some is President, you know, doesn't make him better than me.''

There it was. To be a leader that good old boys related to, you had to have a fierce egalitarian spirit, the spirit that made Harry Truman ''the man of the people.'' Truman's view was that a person should be judged without regard to material possessions or social position. Each individual has an inherent and independent worth, regardless of knowledge or wealth. Nobody has a monopoly on morality or wisdom. No American should be expendable. Each man and woman in our democracy should have a voice in charting our collective future.

I, too, believe in these values and have tried to infuse them in my pubic service. But Harry Truman was not the first person to preach these ideals; they come directly from the Declaration of Independence, which to me is our most important historical document. Times have changed since July 4, 1776, but the idea that all people are equally imbued with the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness and that no individual is more important than another remains at the heart of what makes America special. And, indeed, national government is constituted in part to guarantee this individual right through the exercise of public power.

In further reflection on Truman's career, characteristics other than his ''common touch'' also stand out. He sent comprehensive civil rights legislation to Congress when it was supported by only 6% of the national public, according to one Gallup Poll. He acted on his own authority to desegregate the armed forces. Speaking as the first President to address the NAACP, he declared that all Americans were entitled to, not only civil rights, but decent housing, education, and medical care. Such political courage is all too rare.

Today, people have become so cynical about politics that they think all elected officials are controlled—by special interests who give them campaign money, by pollsters who tell them that thought is not as important as focus group phrases, by political parties which often stifle their independent judgment, and by their own ambition which rarely permits them to call things like they really see them, for fear of angering a constituency group that will be needed for a future election. While most politicians do not knowingly say something false, they tend to emphasize the issue that the group to which they are speaking agrees with. That is commonly referred to as ''good politics,'' but it is the exact opposite of the Truman way of ''telling it like it is.''

But perhaps Truman's most important characteristic was that he stood up for the working American in a way few politicians have. In 1947 and 1948, Truman issued dozens of vetoes on legislation passed by a reactionary Republican congress not unlike the one we have today. In mid-1947, Truman vetoed two popular Republican tax cut proposals because they would have favored the right and penalized the middle-class through higher inflation.

Truman's most famous veto of the anti-labor Taft-Hartley Act, was overridden by a Congress responding to polls that showed most Americans believed the unions—then representing 24% of the workforce—had become too powerful and needed to be restrained. Truman felt that Taft-Hartley went too far and would, he said, ''take fundamental rights away from our working people.'' He did not flinch. He acted as a truly progressive president, unafraid to use public power.

At the end of World War II, Harry Truman needed to find a way to cushion the effects of the armed forces demobilization. War contracts would be canceled, price controls would be ended, war-time labor agreements would expire, and millions of service men and women would come home looking for jobs. Some predicted a return of the Depression.

His solution was a 21-point program offering economic security to every American citizen. Truman's reconversion plan urged an extension of unemployment compensation, an increase in the minimum wage, expansion of social security, extension of the GI Bill, universal health insurance, and what he called ''full-employment'' legislation that would guarantee a job to every able-bodied American willing to work. Parts of the program were considered radical even in the era just after the New Deal. And while many of Truman's proposals never became law, the breadth of his approach showed that he was thinking of the well-being of all classes in America. And indeed, all classes shared in the boom: Unemployment all but disappeared. Real living standards were higher when he left office than when he took over from F.D.R.

I believe that America is at a similar economic crossroads today as we move into the information age and that we again need approaches of breadth and innovation to assure the American dream for our people. They start with a reinvigoration of public power—our power.

The use of public power still has a valid role to play in ensuring fairness and economic security for all Americans. We need to use our collective power to help individuals cope with changing economic times, to ensure competition among market participants and to prevent harm to the general welfare. There is simply no other way to check the excesses of private power except through public power.

Such a willing use of public power disputes the Republican notion that the private sector has all the answers and will automatically relieve the fears of working Americans. It is also different from the belief that to every social problem in America there is an answer which has as its centerpiece a federal bureaucracy delivering services through regional and state bureaucracies. For example, there are 58 federal programs for poverty and 154 federal programs for job training. Yet, worker retraining without new jobs being available leads nowhere.

Idealism without resources is impotent. Just ask anyone who thought that charitable giving could end poverty. Idealism without accountability wastes money. Just ask anyone who thought that HUD was sufficient to stabilize the decline of urban America.

I start with the belief that the market is the most efficient allocator of resources and frequently the most powerful undefined force in American life. It rewards those with the highest skills, best processes and most desired products. An ideal market would deliver the best quality at the lowest price in the shortest time. But the market is impartial and can be cruel in its verdicts, with the result that many people get hurt. To cushion the impact of the market is not easy to do and remain fair. Usually those who escape the judgment of the market in our current political system are not broad classes of similarly situated individuals, but rather companies or individuals with the best-connected lobbyist. Such is the inequality of the administrative state, full of rules and exceptions, definitions and effective dates. How to benefit from the market's dynamism while protecting against the dislocation that it sometimes causes remains our dilemma.

I have always believed that the message of America is that if you work hard you can get ahead economically, if you get involved, you can change things politically and if you reason patiently enough you can extend quality to all races and both genders. Today, many Americans doubt these basic American precepts. In the information economy, four computer workstations replace 300 people in a credit department no matter how hard they work. In our political dialogue, money drowns out the voices of the people. In our social interactions, few risk candor to create racial harmony.

For nearly 20 years, the rhetoric of economic conservatives has demonized government. Without making the distinction between federal programs and public power, they labeled government programs as waste and government rules as limitations on freedom. The result has been that millions of Americans concluded that government took their money in taxes but worked for someone other than them. What most people have missed is that, while government can be distant and ineffective, public power can speak to people where they live their lives.

Public power isn't labor intensive; it doesn't require massive decentralized programs delivering services to millions of people; it won't guarantee full employment. But

applied in the right way at the right time in the right place, it can balance private power. Public power works only if individuals are better off when it is exercised; only if it enhances an individual's prospects for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Public power often means preventing the ethos of the market from dominating other equally important ethics—democratic, environmental, human, spiritual. Public power can never replace the memories, places and stories of these other ethics, but it can prevent the cacophony of modern life from drowning out their voices. Public power must always focus on the long-term; it must always be accountable; it must never be exercised arrogantly; it must always be a balancing force so that life can be whole and market economic forces, while giving us low prices and high quality, do not control our beings or destroy our humanity.

Workers caught in the midst of wage stagnation and economic downsizing need public power to balance private power. Millions of Americans are one or two paychecks away from falling out of middle-class status and are never able to put away enough so they feel comfortable. During the first six months of 1993, the Clinton Administration announced that 1.3 million jobs had been created, to which a TWA machinist replied, ''Yeah, my wife and I have four of them.''

The heavy footsteps of relocation, part-time jobs, temp jobs, middle age without health care and retirement without a pension have made their way to the doorsteps of too many American families. Millions of Americans no longer look to the single workplace of the family's main breadwinner as the site where their standard of living will improve. Wages have been stagnant for too long. Too many good jobs have disappeared. Too many expectations have been shattered.

Who can an individual turn to for help when caught in this economic trauma? The Church doesn't have resources or temporal power; the unions now represent only 11% of the workforce. The same man who things his deteriorating economic circumstance is caused by government finds that only government has the power to counter corporate power. When the AT&T worker loses his job (as 7,000 have in New Jersey during the past three months), his rugged individualism is no match for the company's power. When a downsized IBM engineer who formerly earned $60,000 takes a job for $45,000, a $300 tax cut is a poor substitute. To work hard, play by the rules and take your reward without worrying about your fellow workers sounds fine until the rules change and the pink slip arrives. Only then does the solitary individual sense his powerlessness.

Only public power can reduce the trauma for people being thrown out of work without pensions, health care, or a chance of getting another job at equal pay. People need an economic security platform that will allow them to ride the rapids of this economic transformation. That platform should consist of the following: a year of company-paid health care for the family of the downsized worker who has been employed by a company of at least one hundred workers for at least ten years. If you have a pension, it ought to be portable. Why should a person who worked 22 years in one place still be unable to have a pension simply because the place was owned by three separate companies in those 22 years, and he vested in none of them.

In addition to health care and pensions, people increasingly need educational opportunity throughout their working lives. Professor Albert Einstein once monitored a graduate physics exam and a student ran up to him and said, ''Professor, these questions are the same as those on the test that was given last year,'' to which Einstein replied, ''Well, that's okay, because this year the answers are different.'' In the information age, the answers are going to be different every year and unless you have lifetime education, you're not going to be able to come up with them.

But issues of public power—the collective expression of the people's power—extend to areas beyond the need for an economic security platform in the midst of economic turmoil. Take for example America's public lands—the one third of the land mass of America that is owned by the federal government. It belongs to all of us; it is our patrimony. The miners, ranchers, loggers and corporate farmers of irrigated land do not own it. From the beautiful Red Rock wilderness of Utah to the majestic peaks of Alaska's Brooks range, there are places that mankind has not yet altered. They are as they have been for thousands of years. And if we want our children to experience them in their pristine form, we must, as the Iroquois did, think of the effect of our actions seven generations ahead. The only way to prohibit the natural resource industries from forcing the timeless expanses of wilderness to fit a calendar of quarterly earnings is for public power to say ''no,'' acting in behalf of all of us and for the generations to come.

Another example of public power lies in our ability to reduce the role of money in our democratic process and to better inform the voters so they can shape our collective future. Today, candidates, in order to get their story across, collect campaign contributions from special interests and the wealthy and then give the money to local TV stations to run campaign TV ads that often malign the character, distort the record or overwhelm the prospects of a hapless opponent with less money. Yet if one were only to think about it, the solution to this national embarrassment is commonsensical. TV largely comes over the airwaves. The public—all of us—own the airwaves. They don't belong to local network affiliates. We have the power to require time to be available to political candidates for president and the Senate. If democracy suffers from inadequately informed citizens and citizens are disdainful of politics in part because of campaign money then public power should require local TV stations to give a specific amount of free time to Senate candidates to make their case. The public airwaves are not private property.

Even on the issue of race, there is a role for public power. Some institutions resist change. Some companies deny white skin privilege. Even some governmental institutions have needed additional pressure to level the playing field. Yet there is no timely enforcement mechanism for the civil rights laws that declare discrimination in job promotions illegal. Because individuals are being hurt by discrimination only public power can counter it. That is why the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission should be given cease and desist authority to being discrimination cases to a close.

In all these areas—the guarantee of an economic security platform for individuals caught in the turmoil of economic transformation; the protection of pristine public lands for generations of individuals to enjoy as our forefathers did; the requirement to devote some of the public airwaves to the dialogue of democracy; the ability of public entities to determine if discrimination exists and to rectify it—you do not need government programs and vast service-delivery bureaucracies. You simply need what Harry Truman never shied away from—a willingness to use public power for those with relatively less power and to do so in the name of the people, so that each individual will have a better chance for the realization of his or her inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

One final area where the American people have latent power concerns the American corporation itself. The American corporation exists because the people gave it status and limited liability. Such a grant was thought to be in the public interest. Yet we measure the performance of a corporation narrowly, by the financial balance sheet, even though we all know that the corporation affects all of us in many ways apart from the financial balance sheet.

As we are entering the information age, it is important to find a way to report not only financial data but information on the impact of the corporation on its workers, its community, and on the environment. We need something similar to the form of the financial balance sheet developed by the Financial Accounting Standards Board, but for the worker, the community, and the environment. The requirement that corporations adhere to standards for the full disclosure of financial information has made U.S. capital markets the most vibrant in the world and has given every investor equal access to the same information. Full disclosure of the corporate impact on workers, communities and the environment will create unforseen pressures and innovations. The result may well be not only a country with more long-term growth in its economy, but also with more security and self-fulfillment for its citizens.

If information is available to the broadest number of people, the market can often produce the result we want without the heavy-handed intervention of government. By the year 2000 there will be one billion users of the Internet, up from today's 50 million users. There will be more global traffic on the Internet in the year 2000 than is now on telephone lines. With corporate information beyond the financial balance sheet flowing to users indiscriminately, many more people will be empowered. Hierarchy will give way as power shifts down to pension fund managers who think about the daily lives of workers as well as the highest return on investment, to churches who want to measure a company's profession of values against their real-world performance, to small investors who want to follow ''green'' investments or champion community responsibility at the same time they want to maximize profit. With newly available information, groups such as these can create a culture of accountability that will lead to a more stable and humane American society.

Power will also flow down to the knowledge worker. Wealth will come less from natural resources or even capital, because capital will follow knowledge. Microsoft—whoever heard of it ten years ago? Now it's one of the biggest companies in the world.

In such an economy, the knowledge workers—those who write the software programs, design the hardware, anticipate the new linkages of information networks—have enormous opportunity to effect change. If the brightest talent recoils from working for a corporation that pollutes, ignores it community or mistreats its laid-off employees, then the corporation will suffer because it won't attract the knowledge talent that it needs to raise the capital for its growth. As a group, knowledge workers potentially possess more power than industrial robber barons, natural resource magnates or international financiers of previous eras.

In a way, this offers the potential for a creative use of market power. If public policy objectives—clean environment, a diverse workforce, more sensitivity to the human needs of longtime employees—can be carried out by the market, results will be longer lasting. People can then do well economically and do good socially at the same time.

In my own Senate career, tax reform, which eliminated loopholes for the few while lowering rates for all Americans, allowed equal incomes to pay about equal tax at the same time the market functioned better. Reducing the subsidy for irrigated agriculture in California benefitted urban and environmental users by making them, given the functioning of a more open water market, more likely to obtain water for California's long-range nonagricultural needs. In both cases, it was a matter not of subsidizing a desired objective but of removing the subsidy for the activity that had come to have a distorting impact on the whole community. Central to achieving a better world through the market is removing subsidies from everything except those ways of thinking which are themselves not susceptible to economic calculation. How much is wilderness worth? How do we determine the economic value of a health democracy or racial harmony? How long will the hard pressed middle class believe in the American dream? These are the areas where public power, not the market, play the decisive role.

Again, I thank you for this award. Harry Truman was a leader of candor and courage with a common touch and a determination to serve all the people. The challenge to our future is to recognize, as Truman did, that well-exercised public power can benefit individuals and, as I sense, that in the new economy, information can be a tool that allows the market to serve ethics other than just the economic. This combination of the use of public power and the understanding that a market can do good socially at the same time it does well economically can build a more stable, more prosperous, more humane, more democratic America.

THE SUBJECT OF RACE

(by Senator Bill Bradley)

Tonight, I want to talk about an issue of American political life about which there is endless talk dealing with surfaces, and very little movement deep down in the body politic. Unless faced, it will prevent us from realizing our potential as a pluralistic democracy with a growing economy and instead it will foster a poisonous resentment, even a hatred that kills much of life's joy. The subject is race.

Frequently, we Americans have been unable to see deeper than skin color or eye shape to the heart and individuality of all our fellow Americans. There were times when we allowed destructive impulses to triumph over our deeper awareness that we are all God's children. Occasionally, the violence of the few elicited the fears and seething anger of the many and prevented the possibility of racial harmony. It's an old story, and a sad one, too. Let me tell you a story.

In 1963, four young African American girls in white dresses were talking prior to Sunday services in the ladies lounge of the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama. Suddenly, the church was ripped apart by a bomb which killed the young girls instantly. There had been other bombings in Birmingham aimed at halting blacks' progress toward racial equality but they had not penetrated the national consciousness. After that Sunday's explosion, people of all races and all political persuasions throughout the country were sickened in spirit. Coming eighteen days after Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. had shared his dream for America from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, the bombing was a stark reminder of how violently some Americans resisted racial healing. Yet the sense of multiracial outrage and solidarity that came out of this tragedy, combined with the seminal leadership of President Lyndon Johnson, led to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and to the hope that the search for racial equality could lead to the emergence of a spiritually transformed America.

In the summer of 1964 I was a student intern in Washington. I remember being in the Senate chamber the night the Civil Rights bill passed, the one that de-segregated restaurants, hotels, and other accommodations. I watched the vote and thought, Something happened in the chamber tonight that makes America a better place. To be honest, that was the night that the idea of being a U.S. Senator first occurred to me. I thought, Maybe someday I can be in the U.S. Senate too and make America a better place.

As I recently recalled that summer of 1964, I was reminded that slavery was our original sin. Race remains our unresolved dilemma, and today, the bombers are back. From an urban church in Knoxville, Tennessee, to countless rural churches in South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, Texas, North Carolina, and Alabama, the flames of arson and the hatreds of racism burn again.

On the narrow subject of burning churches, there has been rare bipartisan outrage. Conservative Republican Senator Lauch Faircloth of North Carolina said last week on the Senate floor that, ''if we in Congress cannot agree that church burning is a despicable crime, what can we agree on? It's not a matter of liberals, conservatives, blacks, whites; it is about justice, faith, right, wrong.'' And he and Senator Ted Kennedy introduced a bill to toughen the laws against church arson.

Well-meaning whites have also stepped forward to help rebuild churches. The National Council of Churches and the Anti-Defamation League have established national rebuilding funds. Eight foundations have announced grants totaling $2.5 million to the National Council of Churches burned churches fund. Habitat for Humanity is coordinating the labor of volunteers who want to rebuild. Teams of Mennonites and Quakers are rebuilding churches in Alabama. Raytheon, E-Systems and AT&T have pledged $50,000 each to rebuild burned churches in Greenville, Texas. Friendship Baptist Church and Canaan AME in Columbia, Tennessee were repaired so quickly, with the aid of local whites, that no services were missed. Hundreds of callers to a Dallas radio station spontaneously offered money to help. The conservative Christian Coalition, which met with African American church leaders on Wednesday, pledged to raise $1 million to help rebuild. It is also making money available for motion detectors, alarms, floodlights, and smoke detectors for rural churches that are most vulnerable to arson attacks. The National Trust for Historic Preservation has announced a campaign to provide financial and technical support to more than two dozen African American churches hit by arson attacks. Nations Bank posted a $500,000 reward for information leading to the arrest and conviction of people responsible for the attacks. The Southern Baptists pledged $300,000 at their annual convention last week to assist in the rebuilding effort. On Wednesday, the Laborers' International Union of North America announced that it will rebuild Sweet Home Baptist Church in Baker, Louisiana.

But beyond deploring, rebuilding, toughening laws and rewarding informants, what can you do? Well, you can look deeper into the soul of America. You can be aware of the context in which these acts are taking place. You can be alert to emerging connections among white supremacist groups dedicated to racial violence. You can ponder whether you see your own reflection in the pool of indifference that has surrounded racial healing for much of the last 15 years in America.

Let's start with who is committing the burnings. The *Washington Post* has said that the perpetrators are disproportionately young white males who, although some come from the right side of the tracks, are more often economically marginalized and poorly educated. These are the children of the economic transformation and the products of a television culture surfeited with instant gratification and quick thrill violence. They are the sons of families who have forgotten the power of love.

For twenty years, wages have been stagnant for 70 percent of the workers in America. In 1973, production, non-supervisory wages were $315 per week; by 1994 they fell to $256, which confirms what most Americans know: They're working harder for less, living two paychecks away from falling out of the middle class. No matter how many jobs they work, they can never put away enough to guarantee their children a college education. With less in wages, both parents have to work. Forty percent of the kids live in homes in which both parents work. Add to that the 25% of the kids who live with a single parent and that means that for 65% of the kids there are often resource and time deficits between parent and child.

Now comes economic downsizing where hundreds of thousands, no matter how hard they work, have lost their jobs. The economic transformation has made them redundant. Three hundred people in a credit department are replaced by four computer workstations; two hundred people in Accounts Receivable are bumped by two computer workstations. The heavy footsteps of downsizing, relocation, part-time jobs, temp jobs, middle age without health care and retirement without a pension may be near or still distant, but they are heard in every home. And for the children of families that have lived through stagnant wages and downsizing, their future seems even more uncertain. A decade ago they were called latchkey kids, and now too many of them call themselves skinheads. The idea that working hard can lead to a secure future, a chance to provide for a better life for their children and an adequate retirement, is slipping away. In its place comes the quick fix of drugs and the quick thrill of violence. Add to this the need for a high quality education in order to get good jobs in the future and the absence of parental savings to pay for that education, and for many millions of young people, their future seems bleak.

Racism breeds among the poorly educated and economically marginalized. They don't see the deeper forces at work in the economy. They don't sense the self-interest in greater tolerance. They can't see the joy in brotherhood and can't escape the prison of ingrained racial attitudes. Instead, they focus on a scapegoat as the cause of the predicament. ''It's aways the other guy's fault,'' becomes their theme song, and the scapegoat often becomes the ''the other''—someone who looks different from them. In a world where politics doesn't adequately address the economic realities, fears can accelerate and demagogues can arise to manipulate those fears for their own ends.

Take affirmative action. Whether you're for it or against it, keep the numbers in mind. More white Americans lost their jobs in the 1982 recession because of terrible national economic mismanagement than lost their jobs to all the court-ordered affirmative action since its inception. The young white who feels that every time he doesn't get a job it's been taken by a black simply doesn't know the numbers. And politicians or talk show hosts who perpetrate and promote that overreaction are similar to the person who throws a match on a pile of oily rags.

Likewise, take poverty. There are thirty-six million people in poverty in America: Ten million are black; twenty-six million are white. But many young whites oppose government helping the poor because it means government helping blacks, not realizing that, given their education levels and job prospects, their opposition is often self-destructive.

In a world where people don't see the underlying forces—the economic transformation, the TV culture, the marginal numbers affected by affirmative action, the racial structure of poverty—too many people take aim at blacks or immigrants as the cause of their economic distress. But the seven thousand downsized workers at AT&T who've lost their jobs in the last six months in New Jersey did not lose their jobs because of immigrants or because of blacks, but because the company, acting rationally in a time of rapid change, could maximize profits by letting them go. When people feel desperate, they reach for the extremes that in good times they would steer away from. And when they live in the extremes, violence can be an action of first resort.

What can we do about the context of church burnings beyond having more economic growth more fairly shared and an education system that teaches tolerance as well as trigonometry?

Let's start with what politicians can do. Too often, white politicians have played the ''race card'' to get votes but, to be honest, too often, black politicians have played the ''racist'' card for the same reason. What has suffered is honest dialogue and common action. We need more candor and more voice from elected leaders who will choose to challenge their constituents morally as well as challenge their contributors financially. But without engagement you can't have candor, and without candor you can't have progress. When was the last time you talked about race with someone of a different race? Although I'm leaving the Senate, I'm not leaving public life and I intend to continue to speak out on the need for racial healing. I'll look constantly for ways to move the dialogue about race to a deeper level, as yet unattained. For example, at the Democratic political convention, I'll seek to demonstrate what is possible, and I'll call on good people in both parties to step forward in this time of confusion and rising tensions. Politicians have the obligation to play to our higher aspirations as LBJ did back in 1964.

Talk show hosts also have some responsibility. While some of you can be divisive, and maybe even racist, most of you are not. My appeal is only to remember the paradox of free speech: it can be the nutrient that allows the tree of democracy to grow strong, but if misused, it can burn the roots and deform the tree in ways no one ever expected. Civility is the key and avoidance of the easy appeal to stereotypes should be what you strive for. Remember there was once a time in America when an audience laughed simply at the appearance of a white actor in black face. Now we recognize that we are a better people than that. The potential of confusion is too great for those with the microphones not to promote a deeper dialogue on race. The misunderstandings are too deep for you not to search the heart as well as find the pulse of your audience. I know it's asking a lot, but then so do the ideals of our founders.

As a way of thinking about our responsibilities to each other let me close by asking you first to imagine that you are a black parent of a nine year-old girl, and then imagine that you are a white parent of a nine year-old son. A church bombing has occurred in your church or in your town. What does one say?

What answer does a church member give to his 9 year old African American daughter when she asks, ''Daddy, why did this happen?'' What can one say to a daughter who has written her school paper on Colin Powell, taken pride in American having a Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday, grown up eating Jell-O because of Bill Cosby and watched Michael Jordan become a worldwide marketing phenomenon. In a world where so much progress had been made, how could one explain the phenomenon of burning churches?

And what about the white parent? What does he say to his 9 year-old son? How can he explain the phenomenon of the skinheads, bold Ku Klux Klanners or the new Nazi SS clubs in high schools? How can he explain why blacks and whites can't get along in life like they appear to get along on the Chicago Bulls. What does he say about the burnings?

I imagine the black parent saying something like this to his daughter: ''There is evil in the world, and there are some people who, because of the color of your skin, do not view you as an equal member of society. These people have a problem, and the problem is called racism. There were black and white people who, decades ago, died so that black people could enjoy equal opportunities with white people in America. America is a much better place with respect to the way that black people and white people interact than it was black when brave Americans suffered to bring about equality.

''Racism is an evil and a sickness. You have the physical and intellectual capacities to achieve whatever you want to achieve, to be the best you can be. Look at Colin Powell, Toni Morrison, Cornel West. The people who burned this church are afraid of you; they are afraid to learn about you and interact with you. You must not be afraid of them. You must pray for them and ask God to forgive them. You must use your talents to achieve greatness in life, and you must work in your lifetime to help bridge the racial divide.

''Finally, try to understand what a great African-American writer James Baldwin once said in 1957 to his young nephew who was afraid of racial violence during the civil rights demonstrations of the early '60s—He said, 'it was intended that you should perish in the ghetto, perish by never being allowed to go behind the white man's definitions, by never being allowed to spell your proper name. You have and many of us have defeated this intention; and, by a terrible law, a terrible paradox, those innocents who believed that your imprisonment made them safe are losing their grasp on reality. But these men are your brothers—your lost, younger brothers. And if the word ''integration'' means anything, this is what it means: that we, with love, shall force our brothers to see themselves as they are, to cease fleeing from reality and begin to change it. For this is your home, my friend, do not be driven from it; great men have done great things here, and will again, and we can make America what America must become.'''

And what should a white parent tell his 9-year-old son about these church burnings? I imagine he would say something like this: ''The burning of the African American church outside our town is a product of racism and hatred. Racism occurs when people of one race feel themselves to be superior to those of another race for no other reason than the color of the skin. I know that sounds like a stupid thing to do, but this country has had a sad history of doing it. African Americans, Native Americans and Asian Americans, among others, have suffered because of it. It is important for you to know that racism is everyone's problem, both white and black. It's the kind of problem that no one else can solve for you. Like any other illness, you have to get over it yourself with your own resources as a good human being fighting it off. Racism is something that a person learns; it is not something that people are born with. That's why I punished you the first time you came home from school disparaging someone because of their race. Where racism exists, both black people and white people are harmed. Where it exists, white people cannot develop their full potential as individuals. To harbor racism in your heart is to deny yourself the experience of learning from someone a little different from you. And it makes you unable to share the joy of our common humanity.

''A the church burnings reveal, just as they revealed in the story I once told you about the four young girls in Birmingham in 1963, racism is ugly and evil, and God does not like evil. Sometimes, racism comes from black people who call us devils and deny our individuality as much as some white people deny theirs. Whether it comes from white or black it is wrong, and violen is never acceptable. Remember what Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said, 'Returning violence for violence multiplies violence, adding deeper darkness to a night already devoid of stars. Darkness cannot drive out darkness, only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that.'

''I am going to volunteer to go and help rebuild the church that was burned. I want you to come with me. I want you to bring Charlie, one of your black friends from school. I want you to work side by side with Charlie, with me, and with other blacks and whites who want to build a country that is compassionate and that treats all of its people with dignity and respect. I want you to treat everyone with respect, and I want you to work in your lifetime to bridge the racial divide.

''A Russian writer named Leo Tolstoy once said, ''many people want to change the world; only a few people want to change themselves,'' but with race you can't change the world unless you change yourself.''

And, I might add, that's as true for politicians as for talk show hosts. And when enough Americans change themselves, we will have true racial healing and then the result will be a spiritually transformed America.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed in morning business for 15 minutes. I see other Senators are on the floor here, and if that is inconvenient to them, I will ask for a shorter period of time. Let me just place the unanimous-consent request, and they can feel free to state a problem, if they have it. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed in morning business for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 15 minutes.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING SENATORS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, it is time to say farewell to a number of our colleagues and friends. These are not easy good byes. I have served with many of our departing colleagues since I first came to the Senate in 1978. We were freshmen together, had to learn the ropes as new kids on the block together. That process of learning and